

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,065	05/07/2001	Thierry Cruanes	50277-1522	2871

29989 7590 05/19/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

BANANKHAH, MAJID A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2127

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/851,065	CRUANES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Majid A Banankhah	2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application filed on May 07, 2001. Claims 1-24 are considered for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zait et al. (U.S.Pat. No. 6,665,684, hereinafter Zait) in view of Baru (U.S.Pat. No. 5,878,409, hereinafter Baru).

Per claims 1, 11, 21, and 23, a method for performing parallel operations on a pair of objects in a system that includes a plurality of nodes to enable using an increased degree of parallelism (Zait reference, U.S., Pat. No. 6,665,684), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

distributing first-phase partition-pairs of a parallel partition-wise (see Zait, col. Multi

Dimensional partitioning, composite partitioning, col. 3, lines 25-45, and col. 4, lines 51-57, first

level partition) operation on the pair of objects among the plurality of nodes (col. 6, lines 5-15,

and lines 18-30); at a particular node of said plurality of nodes (col. 6, lines 18-30, different

nodes), performing the steps of: partitioning the one or more first-phase partition-pairs

distributed to the particular node to produce a set of second-phase partition-pairs (col. Second

level partitioning, col. ; and assigning each second-phase partition-pair from the set of

second-phase partition-pairs to a slave process (col. 8, lines 31-47).

Art Unit: 2127

While the reference of Zait teaches of assigning the partitions of the object as the subsets of data for distribution to **slave processes** (Zait, col. 8, lines 48-55), he fails to teach assigning to separate slave process. However, the reference of Baru in the same field of endeavor teaches of a system wherein the data of the partitioned table are distributed across a subset of the nodes in accordance with the partitioning arrangement in order for the database to be more controllable by controlling the number of nodes on which a table is stored (see, Baru, Abstract, and col. 3, lines 57 to col. 4, lines 7, and col. 5, lines 9-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zait's invention by Baru, assignment method, i.e. assign partition pars to separate slave processes in order to increase efficiency by avoiding congestion and increasing parallelism.

Regarding the mapping of each duple from a source object to a corresponding static partition in claims 21 and 23, see Baru in col. 5, lines 61 to col. 6, line 6.

Per claims 2 and 12, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 1 and further, wherein the step of assigning each second-phase partition-pair from the set of second-phase partition-pairs to a separate slave process is performed by assigning each second-phase; partition-pair from the set of second-phase partition pairs to a separate slave process within said particular node (See Baru, col. 3, lines 7-20).

Per claims 3 and 13, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 1 and further, wherein the parallel partition-wise operation is a parallel full partition-wise operation (see Zait, col. Multi Dimensional partitioning, composite partitioning, col. 3, lines 25-45, and col. 4, lines 51-57, firs level partition).

Art Unit: 2127

Per claims 4 and 14, the claim is rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 1 and further, wherein the parallel partition-wise operation is a parallel partial partition-wise operation (Multi Dimensional partitioning, composite partitioning).

Per claims 5 and 15, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 1 and further, wherein the step of partitioning the one or more first-phase partition-pairs and the step of assigning second-phase partition-pairs are performed at each node that has multiple slave processes available for participating in said parallel partition-wise operation. The system of Zait teaches of multiple slave processes in col. 8, lines 39-55).

Per claims 6 and 16, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 1 and further, further comprising the steps of determining whether a total number of slave processes available for participating in a second parallel partition-wise operation has a particular logical relationship to a number of first-phase partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation; if the total number of slave processes available for participating in the second parallel partition-wise operation has said particular logical relationship to the number of first-phase partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation (see Zait, col. 10, lines 16-38), then at said particular node performing the steps of:

partitioning the one or more first-phase partition-pairs distributed to the particular node for the second parallel partition-wise operation to produce a set of second-phase partition-pairs; and

Art Unit: 2127

assigning the second-phase partition-pairs from the set of second-phase partition-pairs to slave processes within the particular node to cause the number of slave processes participating in said second parallel partition-wise operation on said particular node to be greater than the number of first-phase partition-pairs that were distributed to said particular node (Zait, col. 10, lines 54 to col. 11, line 3);

if the total number of slave processes available for participating in the second parallel partition-wise operation does not have the particular logical relationship to the number of first-phase partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation, then distributing said first-phase partition-pairs to slave processes without performing second-phase partitioning (col. 11, lines 15-36).

Per claims 7 and 17, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 6 and further, wherein the step of partitioning the one or more first-phase partition-pairs and the step of assigning the second-phase partition-pairs are performed at each node that has more slave processes available for participating in said second parallel partition-wise operation than the number of first-phase partition pairs that are distributed to the node (col. 11, lines 15-18).

Per claims 8 and 18, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 6 and further,

wherein the total number of slave processes available for participating in the second parallel partition-wise operation has the particular logical relationship to the number of first-phase

Art Unit: 2127

partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation if the total number of slave processes available for participating in the second parallel partition-wise operation is greater than the number of first-phase partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation (col. 11, lines 57 to col. 12, line 32).

Per claims 9 and 19, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 6 and further,, wherein the total number of slave processes available for participating in the second parallel partition-wise operation has the particular logical relationship to the number of first-phase partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation if the total number of slave processes available for participating in the second parallel partition-wise operation is at least an order of magnitude greater than the number of first-phase partition-pairs of the second parallel partition-wise operation (Zait, col. 10, lines 54 to col. 11, line 3).

Per claims 10 and 20, the claims are rejected for the reason stated in the rejection of claim 1 and further, wherein the step of distributing first-phase partition pairs is performed based, at least in part, on node affinity with respect to the one or more first has partition-pairs of the parallel partition-wise operation and availability of slave processes for performing the parallel partition-wise operation (Zait, col. 8, lines 48-55).

Per claims 22, and 24, the claims are rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claims 21, and 23 and further, wherein the node distribution criteria includes node affinity with respect to the one or more first-phase partition-pairs of the parallel partition-wise

Art Unit: 2127

operation and availability of slave processes for performing the parallel partition-wise operation. It is well known in the art that affinity is the relationship among data processing elements where there is an inherent likeness or agreement. In this instant situation it would have been more desirable to process the data on the slave process where there is existing data from previous partitioning in there.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Majid A. Banankhah** whose voice telephone number is (703) 308-6903. A voice mail service is also available at this number.

All response sent to U.S. Mail should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park Two, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Six Floor (Receptionist). All hand-delivered responses will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. Please do not hand deliver responses to the Examiner.

All Formal or Official Faxes must be signed and sent to either (703) 308-9051 or (703) 308-9052. Official faxes will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. The date of entry will correspond to the actual FAX reception date unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal Holiday within the District of Columbia, in which case the official date of receipt

Art Unit: 2127

will be the next business day. The application file will be promptly forwarded to the Examiner unless the application file must be sent to another area of the office, e.g., Finance Division for fee charging, etc.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Maid Banankhah

5/17/04


MAJID BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER